

12

LUC-454/Batni 4-5-3

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 13-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-11 and 13-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a). Claims 1-15 and 23 were objected to.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-15 and 23 are objected to because of an informality.

Applicants have responded by amending claims 1 and 23.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-2, 11-17 and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,610 issued to Lin et al. on December 7, 1999.

Claims 3, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,610 issued to Lin et al. on December 7, 1999, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0262020 A1 issued to Karlsson dated November 24, 2005.

Claims 4, 5 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,610 issued to Lin et al. on December 7, 1999, and U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0262020 A1 issued to Karlsson dated November 24, 2005, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,075,982 issued to Donovan et al. on 6,075,982.

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,610 issued to Lin et al. on December 7, 1999 and U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0262020 issued to Karlsson dated November 24, 2005, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2004/0240646 A1 issued to O'Donnell dated December 2, 2004.

13

LUC-454/Batni 4-5-3

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,610 issued to Lin et al. on December 7, 1999 and U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0262020 issued to Karlsson dated November 24, 2005, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,835,856 issued to Patel on 5,835,856.

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,610 issued to Lin et al. on December 7, 1999 and U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0262020 issued to Karlsson dated November 24, 2005, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,075,982 issued to Donovan et al. on 6,075,982, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2004/0240646 A1 issued to O'Donnell dated December 2, 2004.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number U.S. Patent Number 6,373,930 B1 issued to McConnell et al. on April 16, 2002.

Rejection Under Calabrese and Lin

Claims 1-2, 11-17 and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Calabrese in view of Lin.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicants' claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"wherein the one or more subscriber based triggers comprise one or more of Origination_Attempt_Authorized, Collected_Information, and Analyzed_Information triggers; and

wherein the originating mobile switching center encounters the one or more subscriber based triggers prior to the Calling_Routing_Addresss_Available trigger"

As stated in the Office Action, Calabrese does not teach or suggest this limitation. Moreover, applicants note that Lin does not teach or suggest the limitation either. Instead, Lin discloses a technique that focuses on interoperability caused by

service interactions in a multiple SCP environment. Furthermore, Lin discloses (i) Origination Attempt, (ii) Information Collected, and (iii) Information Analyzed triggers, in column 8, lines 23-26. However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, Lin does not disclose, "the originating mobile switching center encounters the one or more subscriber based triggers prior to the Calling_Routing_Addresss_Available trigger".

Thus, the clear teaching of Calabrese and Lin is that the originating mobile switching center does not encounter the one or more subscriber based triggers prior to the Calling_Routing_Addresss_Available trigger.

Therefore the proposed combination of Calabrese and Lin does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicants' claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-11 and 13-15 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Independent claims 16 and 22-23 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by the proposed combination. For example, independent claims 16 recites, "encountering the one or more subscriber based triggers prior to the Calling_Routing_Addresss_Available trigger" and claim 22 recites "means in the one or more media for encountering the one or more subscriber based triggers prior to the Calling_Routing_Addresss_Available trigger" and claim 23 recites, "wherein the originating mobile switching center encounters one or more subscriber based triggers prior to the Calling_Routing_Addresss_Available trigger". The proposed combination of Calabrese and Lin does not teach these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 16 and 22-23 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 17-21 depend from claim 16, these dependent claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Rejection Under Calabrese, Lin, Karlsson, Donovan, O'Donnell, Patel, McConnell

Claims 3, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,610 issued to Lin et al. on December 7, 1999, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0262020 A1 issued to Karlsson dated November 24, 2005.

Claims 4, 5 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,610 issued to Lin et al. on December 7, 1999, and U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0262020 A1 issued to Karlsson dated November 24, 2005, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,075,982 issued to Donovan et al. on 6,075,982.

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,610 issued to Lin et al. on December 7, 1999 and U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0262020 issued to Karlsson dated November 24, 2005, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2004/0240646 A1 issued to O'Donnell dated December 2, 2004.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,610 issued to Lin et al. on December 7, 1999 and U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0262020 issued to Karlsson dated November 24, 2005, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,835,856 issued to Patel on 5,835,856.

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,999,610 issued to Lin et al. on December 7, 1999 and U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0262020 issued to Karlsson dated November 24, 2005, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,075,982 issued to Donovan et al. on 6,075,982, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2004/0240646 A1 issued to O'Donnell dated December 2, 2004.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,236,857 B1 issued to Calabrese et al. on May 22, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number U.S. Patent Number 6,373,930 B1 issued to McConnell et al. on April 16, 2002.

Applicants respectfully traverse these grounds of rejection for the following reasons.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

16

LUC-454/Batni 4-5-3


These rejections are based on the rejection under Calabrese and Lin being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "wherein the originating mobile switching center encounters one or more subscriber based triggers prior to the Calling_Routing_Addresss_Available trigger", as recited in applicants' independent claims 1 and 23, and "encountering the one or more subscriber based triggers prior to the Calling_Routing_Addresss_Available trigger" as recited in applicants' independent claim 16, and "means in the one or more media for encountering the one or more subscriber based triggers prior to the Calling_Routing_Addresss_Available trigger" as recited in applicants' independent claim 22, the combination of Calabrese, Lin, Karlsson, Donovan, O'Donnell, Patel, and McConnell does not supply this missing element. Thus, these combinations do not make obvious any of applicants' claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitation.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicants' attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: February 12, 2007

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Customer Number 47382